



**Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Conference Call**

Thursday, March 7, 2019

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Call-in number: 202-991-0477 **Code:** 283-2221#

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/wtwg/>

Calendar Page: [Link](#)

Agenda

10:00 AM – Introductions and Announcements – Ted Tesler, PA DEP or Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Decision requested: Approval of February 7 meeting minutes.

Decision: The WTWG approved the February 7 meeting minutes.

10:10 AM –Review: Designing Wastewater Scenarios for Phase III WIPs – Suchith Ravi, UMCES

Suchith not available today; Jess Rigelman covered this review. Jess reviewed the guidance presented to the WWTWG in September 2018 for Phase III WIP development for point source scenarios. DC's scenarios are in. WV, NY, and VA's scenarios will be in this week. There will be one wastewater scenario per jurisdiction for use in building Phase III draft WIP scenarios. Draft WIP3s are due April 12 for each jurisdiction. Final WIP3s, including all changes to wastewater data, are due August 9, 2019. Suchith will work with jurisdiction leads to ensure data is complete.

Discussion:

- Jeff Sweeney: For completeness, every facility that is in your recent progress should be in your WIP III wastewater scenarios. The only exception would be facilities that are going offline between the last progress and 2025. Nonsignificant facilities especially need to be checked. CBPO staff will be doing checks and coordinating with jurisdiction leads on scenario completeness. The reason we are only allowing one WW scenario for WIP III is to ensure that nonpoint source WIP III scenarios have a stable WW input deck and point source load in WIP III planning.
- Bill Keeling: I don't know why we wouldn't be able to do multiple WW scenarios, and CAST users could choose the scenario that they want to include in their WIPs.
- Jess Rigelman: Not all CAST users are WIP developers and we want to ensure that CAST is user friendly. We can work with jurisdictions in spreadsheets, and we shouldn't need CAST to work out hypothetical input decks. This schedule and scenario process was agreed on by the WWTWG so we are not changing that decision.
- Keeling: The point of CAST is to change scenarios. For VA we would like to be able to have a couple point source scenarios to look at different combinations of point source and nonpoint source scenarios.
- Sweeney: CAST is for nonpoint source BMPs, and wasn't really designed for wastewater. Point sources are more of a baseline condition on which to build nonpoint source scenarios.

10:30 AM -- BMP Credit Lifespans – Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Jeff reviewed BMP credit lifespans in the model and where this information is available to state technical leads. Tests to see changes in implementation with and without expiration will be run following progress completion. Jeff outlined several reasons why BMPs expired, and that information is available for each BMP for each year. There is discussion of creating a summary of expired BMPs to simplify this information. Jeff addressed questions on effects on loads from BMPs that have expired due to lifespan, failed inspection, or retired BMPs.

Discussion:

- Jeff asked members if there might be an easier way to see the expired BMPs, reasons and effects on loads.
 - Lori Brown supports the summary of expired BMPs for easier visualization.
- Jason Keppler asked if there is a switch that could be developed to see the loads with and without expired BMPs.
 - Jess Rigelman: That's not possible since expired BMPs never make it into CAST. What you need is to compare what has been submitted through NEIEN to what ends up in CAST.
 - Olivia Devereux: That's why you need the state unique ID so that you can compare directly using the state unique ID between NEIEN and CAST.
- Norm Goulet: We just talked about having to simplify the wastewater scenario for CAST users. All local governments are interested in expired BMPs and we need an easy way to see those BMPs that get removed.
- Rigelman: it's not hidden, that is part of every report we send you when you submit progress.
 - Devereux: Expired BMPs never get to CAST. They don't get kicked out, CAST just never gets them. Progress is a separate process.
 - Chris Brosch: We need that information though, so however it needs to happen, we need that information to be accessible.
- Jeremy Hanson: Is there interest in having that information for the public scenarios? Like in the final progress scenario?
- Devereux: Is what is being asked is an addition of invalid BMPs as valid in CAST to see what the load would be if it was valid. Then we could put that into CAST.
 - Greg Sandi: We don't count those BMPs as invalid as the model would, but we calculate that differently. We do want to know the value of those "invalid" BMPs.
 - Sweeney: Those expired BMPs are available as part of the reports we give to you once progress is run. We develop these reports, but it's up to you as jurisdiction leads to communicate those results to your stakeholders in the way that you want to show the results. This is a lot of data at very fine scale—every BMP, thousands of land river segments.
 - Devereux: We might be able to share some solution with just the progress group, but we will have to follow up after the meeting to determine a technical solution.
- Alana Hartman: In CAST, it could be better labelled in those columns in CAST. In NEIEN, expired BMPs show up differently than in CAST, and it's not as intuitive in CAST.
 - Rigelman: We are happy to help re-label those columns to make it more intuitive to

QA/QC.

- Hartman: we also forget how to go about this every year. We need that annual assistance in how to find the information and determining what that means.
- Sarah Lane: More straightforward column headings and better placement of information would go a long way towards easing this process.
- Sweeney: The reason I brief you on this every month is to assist you in understanding where these reports are available and how to read them.
- Doug Goodlander asked about NRCS practices and verification issues with lifespans. Is that issue resolved?
 - Sweeney: This issue has gone up to the EPA Regional Administrator, and EPA is working with USDA to resolve this.
 - Keeling: Do we get spot check information at the state level?
 - Goodlander: USDA does that spot check on 10-15% of BMPs. PA has tens of thousands of agricultural BMPs and we really need USDA to help us with that process.
 - Keeling: That's important for the states to get information on. USDA needs to communicate with the states on those spot checks.
 - Sweeney: This is being worked on. This might come up at the Management Board or the WQGIT. The AgWG will be briefed once more information is available.
 - Hanson: The AgWG is keeping close tabs on this issue, so if you are interested you should keep up with the AgWG proceedings.

10:50 AM – Ongoing Discussion of 2018 Progress, Verification and Schedule – Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Ongoing updates on status of the 2018 Progress model scenario and schedule, including an open discussion about the Progress scenario among WTWG members and attendees – which could include issues with submissions and findings. This item also includes updates on the CBP office's review and verification of BMP and wastewater data submitted in December for the 2018 Progress model assessment.

Discussion:

- Chris Brosch: DE is trying to make the same case that we are behind, and our data is still not complete. When we worked on progress, our questions remained unanswered for too long. You are working on this issue at CBPO, and I would like to support that argument, but I would like to know who to contact to make sure we have time to get data incorporated into progress.
 - Sweeney: This is an issue in all states, not just DE. If this is about the opportunity now to make adjustments, you can contact Lucinda Power and copy Lew Linker. You can also contact Jim Edward and Dana Aunkst. Cosmo Servidio is the highest person you could contact at EPA.
- Keeling: With verification, each year is unique for each BMP depending on the inspection date. You might have some years where verification shows jumps between years due to the inspection date change.
 - Sweeney: Right, and that's perfectly valid. When that happens, we plan to revise the history to correct that historical BMP record. However, because we are in a milestone period, we can't update the public record of historic progress. Internally, we can revise the history and that should make a lot more sense.

- Norm Goulet: For stream restoration, Fairfax was not reporting stream restoration in the correct format. When this was finally corrected, those BMPs got reported in the correct way this year. However, the actual implementation dates for each project is not in the corrected record.
 - Sweeney: That's an issue. Even if you don't have the exact implementation dates written in the record, you need to have an implementation date in the record. We really need to eliminate these big swings in progress BMPs and loads because they don't reflect what's happening on the ground.
 - Goulet: The chain of custody is so long that that's very difficult to do. There is communication that fails on many ends here.
 - Sweeney: Next year, the states will be able to revise the history and I need you to advocate for the correct reporting and documentation for next year's progress. Remember, the management actions are supposed to show the implementation of BMPs on the ground and their effects loads and their effects on dissolved oxygen in the Bay.
 - Keeling: If no impairments are found, then the Bay is delisted. If one impairment is found, it goes back on the impairment list and the TMDL still applies. So the TMDL never really goes away.
- Olivia demonstrated CAST features, including: how to share scenarios in CAST with other CAST users; how to download .txt files with all the BMPs are available in the report download tab. All of the information in the .txt files would be used in developing the watershed-wide scenarios. These .txt files can be opened in Excel and filtered and analyzed. The state-unique-IDs are the best label to track specific BMPs.
- Bill Keeling asked about the input decks for the 2020 milestones and the schedule and process for submitting 2020 milestones inputs.
 - Sweeney: Those numeric milestones will be submitted in a similar way to the annual progress. Likely an input deck to EPA CBPO and then we will work with the states to finalize those milestones.
- Jason Keppler asked Jeff to brief the AgWG at their April 21 meeting on progress, verification, Phase III WIP, and milestones schedules.
 - Jeff Sweeney: That should work. Let's talk offline about what specifics you'd like to bring to the AgWG.

12:00 PM – Adjourned

Call Participants:

Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Jess Rigelman, J7 LLC

Jeremy Hanson, VT

Michelle Williams, CRC

Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC

Doug Goodlander, PA DEP

Pat Walsh, PA DEP

Greg Sandi, MDE

Sarah Lane, MDE

Jason Keppler, MDA

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Lori Brown, DNREC

Chris Brosch, DDA

Clint Gill, DNREC

Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission

Bo Reily

Sheryle Quinn, Dept of Navy